

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,557	03/29/2004	Julie Vogelsang-Switzer	A894698US	8292
	7590 06/28/2007 AFLEUR HENDERSON	EXAMINER		
SUITE 1400, 700 2ND ST. SW			MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI	
CALGARY, A CANADA	B 12P 4V3		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3737	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

£.44		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/810,557	VOGELSANG-SWITZER, JULIE
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		Parikha S. Mehta	3737
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DEPLICED FOR THE MAILING DEPLICED FOR THE MAILING DEPLICED FOR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Deperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutor reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	OATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
′—	,—	s action is non-final. ance except for formal ma	
Disposit	tion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>4-10</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>4-10</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	awn from consideration.	
Applicat	tion Papers		
,	The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 1904 and 09		a) accepted or b) objected to by the
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ction is required if the drawin	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority document  Certified copies of the priority document  Copies of the certified copies of the priority document  application from the International Bureat  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received.  Its have been received in ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage
Attachme	nt(s)		
1) Noti 2) Noti 3) Info	ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) irmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) iver No(s)/Mail Date 9/9/05.	Paper No	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application 

Application/Control Number: 10/810,557 Page 2

Art Unit: 3737

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5 September 2005 was filed after the mailing date of the application for patent on 29 March 2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

# **Drawings**

2. The drawings are objected to because they are informal. Examiner recommends that Applicant replace handwritten portions with formal, typed drawings in order to overcome this objection. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

## Claim Objections

3. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "said radius of curvature of each of said downwardly curved portions" lacks antecedent basis. Examiner suggests that Applicant amend the claim to instead recite "a first radius of curvature" in place of "a radius of curvature" in line 1, and further amend the claim to recite "a second radius of curvature" in place of "said radius of curvature" in line 3 of claim 8. Appropriate correction is required.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/810,557

Art Unit: 3737

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Laubsch (US Patent No. 3,153,412), previously disclosed by Applicant, hereinafter Laubsch ('412). Laubsch ('412) discloses a device comprising a pair of spaced-apart, downwardly curved members adapted to be positioned over a respective upper thigh portion of a patient's legs, a substantially flat portion extending intermediate the pair of curved members wherein the flat portion is adapted to raise and support a pair of male testes (Figs. 1 & 2). Laubsch ('412) shows that the radius of curvature of each of the downwardly curved portions proximate the inner parallel side edges is greater than the radius of curvature of each of the downwardly curved protions proximate the outer side edges (Fig. 3).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Laubsch ('412).

Applicant admits that motivation and methods for supporting the testes during ultrasound examination are well known in the art (Specification, p. 2-3). In the same problem solving area, Laubsch ('412) teaches a method of supporting the testes as previously discussed for claims 8-10. Laubsch ('412) further teaches that use of such a device increases patient comfort and is capable of being securely positioned (col. 1 lines 26-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the commonly known methods of testicular ultrasound by using the device of

Application/Control Number: 10/810,557 Page 4

Art Unit: 3737

Laubsch ('412) instead of prior art support devices in order to enhance support stability and patient

comfort, in view of the teachings of Laubsch ('412).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Cazenave et al (Scrotal cup for testicular ultrasound. Journal of Clinical Ultrasound. 15(5): pp. 357-359.

1987.) teach a related method of supporting the testes with a plastic cup to alleviate patient discomfort

during ultrasound examination.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Parikha S. Mehta whose telephone number is 571.272.3248. The examiner can normally be

reached on M-F, 8 - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian

Casler can be reached on 571.272.4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Parikha S. Mehta

Examiner – Art Unit 3737

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700